

VU Research Portal

Low-carbon transition is improbable without carbon pricing

van den Bergh, Jeroen; Botzen, Wouter

published in

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
2020

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1073/pnas.2010380117](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010380117)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

van den Bergh, J., & Botzen, W. (2020). Low-carbon transition is improbable without carbon pricing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(38), 23219-23220. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010380117>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Low-carbon transition is improbable without carbon pricing

Jeroen van den Bergh^{a,b,c,d,1} and Wouter Botzen^{d,e}

Rosenbloom et al. (1) downplay the role of carbon pricing in climate policy. We counter their criticisms.

The authors claim that framing climate change as a market failure fails to appreciate it is a “system problem.” This overlooks that market failures, such as negative/positive externalities and public goods/bads, represent a clear systemic perspective on problems and policies (2). Carbon pricing (CP) is, moreover, a prime example of systemic policy: It simultaneously shifts choices of consumers, producers, investors, and innovators in all sectors—essential to a low-carbon transformation (3). We agree that additional instruments supporting innovation and escape from carbon lock-in are needed. Historical absence of CP contributed, though, to current lock-in.

The authors suggest that CP means efficiency is an overriding policy priority. However, efficiency requires effectiveness. CP is highly effective as no decision in the economy escapes its influence, resulting in closure of all behavioral and economic holes through which emissions leak. It therefore better limits energy/carbon rebound than other instruments (4). For example, CP discourages spending savings from energy conservation on high-carbon goods, as these will be more expensive. This said, it seems Rosenbloom et al. (1) do not value efficiency much. Inefficient policies contribute, however, to less emissions reduction for a given cost, lower incomes, and unemployment—which will hamper stable political support.

The authors neglect that CP is critical to innovation. However, CP contributes to steering innovations toward low-carbon products and production, because private investors are influenced by price expectations as these codetermine profit opportunities (5). Furthermore, unlike other instruments, CP stimulates among “clean” technologies the cleaner ones, like solar photovoltaic (PV) panels with low-carbon lifecycles (6).

The authors prefer a context-sensitive over a universal approach. However, sector-specific approaches tend to be ad hoc, costly, and susceptible to lobbying, while causing intersectoral carbon leakage. Moreover, climate policy is bound to remain weak if it is fragmented between jurisdictions. Policy harmonization is needed to weaken freeriding and international-competitiveness concerns that hamper stringent policies. A CO₂ price facilitates comparison and harmonization of national policies (7).

Regarding political realities, the authors suggest CP faces much resistance. However, this holds for all serious climate policies. No evidence is provided that other effective instruments receive more political support. On the contrary, CP is quite popular: Almost 60 jurisdictions have implemented it in some form (8).

While CP has been criticized as inequitable, this is not the case if it is complemented by appropriate revenue recycling (9). In fact, no other instrument generates revenues for compensation. To compare, adoption subsidies for rooftop solar PV or electric vehicles even use up money and are inequitable by going to well-off households.

It is not true that CP is only supported by neoclassical economics. Many types of empirical and theoretical studies underpin its effectiveness, including agent-based models describing boundedly rational and socially sensitive behaviors (10).

The literature on low-carbon transitions offers creative policy ideas. It is time that CP is integrated with these into a more complete theory of transition policy.

Acknowledgments

We thank Stefan Drews and Ivan Savin for feedback. J.v.d.B. received support through European Research Council Grant 741087 in EU-Horizon2020.

^aInstitute of Environmental Science and Technology, Autonomous University of Barcelona, 08192 Bellaterra, Spain; ^bICREA, 08010 Barcelona, Spain; ^cSchool of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ^dInstitute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and ^eUtrecht University School of Economics, Utrecht University, 3512JE Utrecht, The Netherlands

Author contributions: J.v.d.B. and W.B. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no competing interest.

Published under the [PNAS license](#).

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: jeroen.bergh@uab.es.

First published September 22, 2020.

-
- 1 D. Rosenbloom, J. Markard, F. W. Geels, L. Fuenfschilling, Opinion: Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 8664–8668 (2020).
 - 2 J. Aldy, A. Krupnick, R. Newell, I. Parry, W. Pizer, Designing climate mitigation policy. *J. Econ. Lit.* **48**, 903–934 (2010).
 - 3 P. Cramton, D. J. C. MacKay, A. Ockenfels, S. Stoft, *Global Carbon Pricing: The Path to Climate Cooperation* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2017).
 - 4 A. Baranzini et al., Carbon pricing in climate policy: Seven reasons, complementary instruments, and political-economy considerations. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change* **8**, e462 (2017).
 - 5 R. Calel, A. Dechezleprêtre, Environmental policy and directed technological change: Evidence from the European carbon market. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **98**, 173–191 (2016).
 - 6 F. Liu, J. van den Bergh, Differences in CO₂ emissions of solar PV production among technologies and regions: Application to China, EU and USA. *Energy Policy* **138**, 111234 (2020).
 - 7 J. C. J. M. van den Bergh et al., A dual-track transition to global carbon pricing. *Climate Policy*, 10.1080/14693062.2020.1797618 (2020).
 - 8 E. Haites, Carbon taxes and greenhouse gas emissions trading systems: What have we learned? *Clim. Policy* **18**, 955–966 (2018).
 - 9 D. Klenert et al., Making carbon pricing work for citizens. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **8**, 669–677 (2018).
 - 10 J. Castro et al., A review of agent-based modelling of climate-energy policy. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change* **11**, e647 (2020).